REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-10 are active in the present application. Independent Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to clarify the technical features of the present invention without the introduction of any new matter. Claims 2, 5-7, 9, and 10 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments made to the independent claims. Claims 9 and 10 have also been amended to change the word "apparatus" to --system--. Support for the amendments made to the independent claims can be found in the specification at page 6, lines 17-22, page 14, line 21-page 15, line 6, page 16, lines 10-13, and page 19, lines 8-17, for example, and in drawing Figures 3B and 6, for example.

Outstanding Action

In the outstanding Office Action, the title was objected to and Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,742,116 to Matsui et al. (hereinafter, Matsui).

Discussion of The Objection to The Title

The objection to the title of the invention is believed to be overcome by the present amendment thereto that reflects the gist of the present invention (i.e., a method for creating and operating cyber-conference including paper presentations and system for the same) in under twenty words as noted in the outstanding Action.

Brief Discussion of The Present Invention

Before considering the prior art rejection based upon Matsui, it is believed that a brief discussion of the present invention would be helpful. In this respect, the present invention relates to a method for creating and operating cyber-conference and system for the same. Independent Claims 1 and 8 require, *inter alia*, that the cyber-conference operation server provides a user client with a presentation paper making-up utility, and that the conference-client receives a paper written by using the presentation paper making-up utility from the user client and publishes a journal including the paper.

Discussion of The Anticipation Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matsui.

Matsui discloses that a security program is installed on a plurality of user terminals, which communicate with one another via an electronic conference room. The electronic conference room is a mere chat room or cyber-space facility where the various users can communicate with each other.

Claims 1 and 8 that requires providing a presentation paper making-up utility to the user client, receiving the presentation paper written using the presentation paper making-up utility from the user client and publishing a journal of papers presented at the cyber-conference that includes the presentation paper from the user client. Thus, Applicants believe that Matsui cannot be said to anticipate the invention of amended independent Claims 1 and 8, as it does not teach every feature of amended independent Claims 1 and 8.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claims 1-10 based upon Matsui is respectfully requested in light of the inclusion of the above noted claim requirement in both the independent base Claims 1 and 8 as well as in dependent Claims 2-7

Application No. 10/029,292 Reply to Office Action of 03/01/05

and 9-10 by virtue of the dependent claims including all of the subject matter of their respective base independent claims.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MATER & NEUSTADT, A.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\RFC\21\217831.AM.DOC

Gregory J. Maier

Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.

Desired A. M. A0 440